REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments.

Claims 1-4 and 6-38 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 12, 20, 25, 31, and 34 being independent. Claims 5 is canceled herein without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 12-18, 20-23, 25, 31 and 34 are amended herein. Support for the claim amendments and additions can be found in the original disclosure. No new matter has been added.

§ 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 3-26, and 28-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,128,655 (Fields et al.) (hereinafter Fields), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,763,334 (Matsumoto et al.) (hereinafter Matsumoto) and in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0016735 (Runge et al.) (hereinafter Runge). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 2 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Fields, in view of Matsumoto and Runge, as applied to claims 1 and 25 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,247,032 (Bernardo et al.) (hereinafter Bernardo). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interest of expediting allowance of the application, claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 12-18, 20-23, 25, 31 and 34 have been amended as proposed during the interview and are believed to be allowable.

Fields in view of Matsumoto and in view of Runge

Claims 1, 3-26, and 28-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Fields in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,763,334 (Matsumoto et al.) (hereinafter Matsumoto and in view of Runge). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claim 1, as currently amended, recites a computer executable method comprising:

- ~~in response to a passage of a time interval, determining whether each of a plurality of content providers has any new content to retrieve;~~
- periodically retrieving a media content from one ~~of~~ or more of ~~the~~ a plurality of content providers, ~~that has new content to retrieve,~~ wherein the retrieved media content is to be displayed in at least one Web page;
- verifying a format of the retrieved media content by comparing a data structure of the retrieved media content with a data structure defined in a schema file;
- rejecting ~~particular~~ the media content if ~~the~~ a format of the ~~particular~~ media content ~~format~~ is not valid; and
- if the ~~particular~~ media content is valid:
  - submitting the media content to a media content database;
  - periodically searching the media content database for a media content matching a display criteria;
  - extracting the matching media content from the media content database;
  - scheduling ~~the particular~~ the matching media content to be displayed at a scheduled time; and
  - displaying ~~the particular~~ the matching media content at the scheduled time, the ~~particular~~ matching media content being displayed by a Web server.

Fields is directed to replicating published web content and associated advertisements in the context of a hosting website, and discloses "brokering a client browser's request for a web page, analyzing the returned content and splitting it into component elements, extracting the desired component elements, recasting the desired elements in the look and feel of the hosting site and sending the recast content to the requesting client as a web page". However, Fields fails to disclose or suggest "periodically retrieving a media content … submitting the media content to a media

content database ... periodically searching the media content database for a media content ... [and] displaying the matching media content at the scheduled time," as presently recited in independent claim 1. Applicant's representative understood the Examiner to tentatively agree that claim 1 as amended would be allowable over at least the references of record.

Runge was cited for its alleged teaching of "an advertising system whereby at a predetermined date before a classified ad expires, [the system] emails an expiration/renewal notice to customer accounts" (Office Action, page 3). However, Runge fails to remedy the deficiencies in Fields noted above with respect to claim 1. For example, Runge fails to disclose or suggest "periodically retrieving a media content" or "periodically searching the media content database for a media content" as presently recited in claim 1.

Matsumoto was cited for its alleged teaching of an advertising system "whereby an ad banner campaign is negotiated for a start and an end period of time of published ads" (Office Action, page 4). However, Matsumoto fails to remedy the deficiencies in Fields noted above with respect to claim 1. For example, Matsumoto fails to disclose or suggest "periodically retrieving a media content" or "periodically searching the media content database for a media content" as presently recited in claim 1.

Thus, Fields, Runge, and Matsumoto, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that they can be combined), fail to disclose or suggest the features of claim 1. Accordingly, as discussed during the interview, independent claim 1 is allowable.

Dependent claims 3-4 and 6-11 depend from independent claim 1 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

Independent claim 12, as presently presented, is directed to periodically retrieving, storing, and displaying content from a plurality of content providers, and recites, among other things, a computer executable method comprising:

- identifying a plurality of content providers;
- ~~in response to a passage of a time interval,~~ periodically determining whether each of the plurality of content providers has any new content to retrieve;
- retrieving new content from the plurality of content providers that have new content to retrieve;
- ~~storing the retrieved content in a central database;~~
- submitting the new content to a content database;
- periodically searching the content database for content matching a display criteria;
- extracting the matching content from the content database;
- scheduling the ~~retrieved~~ matching content to be displayed on a Web page at a scheduled time, wherein the scheduled time is based on an attribute associated with the ~~retrieved~~ matching content; and
- displaying the ~~retrieved~~ matching content on the Web page at the scheduled time.

Fields is directed to replicating published web content and associated advertisements in the context of a hosting website, and discloses "brokering a client browser's request for a web page, analyzing the returned content and splitting it into component elements, extracting the desired component elements, recasting the desired elements in the look and feel of the hosting site and sending the recast content to the requesting client as a web page". However, Fields fails to disclose or suggest "periodically determining whether each of the plurality of content providers has any new content to retrieve ... retrieving new content from the plurality of content providers that

have new content to retrieve … periodically searching the content database for a content matching a display criteria … [and] displaying the retrieved content on the Web page at the scheduled time," as presently recited in independent claim 12. Applicant's representative understood the Examiner to tentatively agree that claim 12 as amended would be allowable over at least the references of record.

Runge was cited for its alleged teaching of "an advertising system whereby at a predetermined date before a classified ad expires, [the system] emails an expiration/renewal notice to customer accounts" (Office Action Page 3). However, Runge fails to remedy the deficiencies in Fields noted above with respect to claim 12. For example, Runge fails to disclose or suggest "periodically determining whether each of the plurality of content providers has any new content to retrieve" as presently recited in claim 12.

Matsumoto was cited for its alleged teaching of an advertising system "whereby an ad banner campaign is negotiated for a start and an end period of time of published ads" (Office Action, page 4). However, Matsumoto fails to remedy the deficiencies in Fields noted above with respect to claim 12. For example, Matsumoto fails to disclose or suggest "periodically retrieving a media content" or "periodically searching the media content database for a media content" as presently recited in claim 12.

Thus, Fields, Runge, and Matsumoto, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that they can be combined), fail to disclose or suggest the features of claim 12. Accordingly, as discussed during the interview, independent claim 12 is allowable.

Dependent claims 13-19 depend from independent claim 12 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

Independent claims 20, 25, 31 and 34, as presently presented, are allowable for reasons similar to the reasons independent claims 1 and 12 are allowable, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant's representative understood the Examiner to tentatively agree that amendments analogous to the amendments made to independent claims 1 and 12 when made to independent claims 20, 25, 31 and 34 would render independent claims 20, 25, 31, and 34 allowable over the cited portions of the references of record. Specifically, none of the references disclose or suggest the feature of:

"~~in response to a passage of a time interval,~~ periodically retrieving a file from each storage location, wherein the file identifies any new content to retrieve from the storage location; … periodically searching the central database for the matching content" as presently recited in independent claim 20.

"a content collector configured to periodically retrieve content from a plurality of content providers in response to a passage of a time interval; … a content scheduler coupled to the content collector, the content scheduler configured to periodically schedule the received content for display and further to periodically schedule the received content for removal", as presently recited in independent claim 25

"a content server configured to periodically retrieve Web-based content from a plurality of Web content providers in response to a passage of a time

interval, wherein the content is defined in an extensible markup language (XML) file ... a Web server coupled to the content server, the Web server including a content structure definition file that defines a proper format for the content, wherein the Web server is configured to maintain a plurality of Web pages that are periodically generated using content stored in the database, and wherein each of the plurality of Web pages is displayed during a scheduled time period associated with content contained in each Web page", as presently recited in independent claim 31

"periodically retrieve content from a plurality of content providers, the retrieved content to be displayed in a Web page periodically schedule the retrieved content to be displayed in the Web page at a first scheduled time based on a first attribute associated with the retrieved content", as presently recited in independent claim 34.

Dependent claims 21-24, 26 and 28-30, 32-33, and 35-38 depend from independent claims 20, 25, 31, and 34 respectively, and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

Fields in view of Matsumoto, and Runge, and further in view of Bernardo

Claims 2 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over

Fields, in view of Matsumoto and Runge, as applied to claims 1 and 25 above, and

further in view of Bernardo. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent claims 2 and 27 depend from independent claim 1 and 25,

respectively, and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional

recited features. Bernardo was cited for its alleged teaching of "an approval process,

whereby a user approves content (offline). When said content is approved, then it is

ultimately published" (Office Action 7). However, Bernardo fails to remedy the

deficiencies in Fields noted above with respect to claims 2 and 27. For example,

Bernardo fails to disclose or suggest "periodically retrieving a media content" or

"periodically searching the media content database for a media content file" as presently

recited in claim 2. Bernardo also fails to disclose or suggest "a content collector

configured to periodically retrieve content from a plurality of content providers in

response to a passage of a time interval; ... a content scheduler coupled to the content

collector, the content scheduler configured to periodically schedule the received content

for display and further to periodically schedule the received content for removal" as

presently recited in claim 27. Thus, Fields, Runge, Matsumoto, and Bernardo, whether

taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that they can be

combined), fail to disclose or suggest the features of claim 2 or claim 27.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1-4 and 6-38 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and an early notice of allowance.

The arguments and amendments presented herein were necessitated by the most recent Office Action, and could not have been presented previously because Applicant earnestly believed that the claims were in condition for allowance at the time of filing the previous response.

If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, **Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned representative to resolve the issue**.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: __1/30/2008___

By: ___/David W. Foster/____
David W Foster
Reg. No. 60902